

Appl. No. 10/619,668
Response dated: July 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 6, 2005

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 6, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-12 and 20-29 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 3 and 20 have been amended and Claim 8 has been canceled, leaving Claims 1-7, 9-12 and 20-29 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the amendment to Claim 1 can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. More particularly, support for amended Claim 1 can at least be found in originally filed Claim 8 and Figure 2. Amendments to Claims 3 and 20 correct inadvertent errors of grammar.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 20-22, 26 and 29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tagusa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,986,738 (hereinafter "Tagusa"). Claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is submitted that Tagusa fails to teach each and every element as set forth in the Claim 1 for at least the reasons described below.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, at least one portion of a boundary of the semiconductor layer substantially coincides with a boundary of the lower film.

Tagusa discloses in Figure 2, the boundary of semiconductor layer 34 clearly not coinciding with either of the transparent conductive (lower) films 37a, 37a'. Similarly in Figure 10, the boundary of the semiconductor layer 64 coincides with neither transparent conductive

Appl. No. 10/619,668
Response dated: July 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 6, 2005

(lower) film 67a,67a'. Thus, Tagusa fails to at least teach the at least one portion of boundary of the semiconductor layer substantially coincides with boundary of the lower film as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct in view of Tagusa. Claims 2-6, 9-10 and 12 variously depending from Claim 1, thus include all the limitations of amended Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2-6, 9-10 and 12 are believed to be patentably distinct in view of Tagusa for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of Claims 1-6, 9-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Tagusa.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,087,678 (hereinafter "Kim").

Kim does not at least teach at least one portion of boundary of the semiconductor layer substantially coincides with boundary of the lower film as recited in amended Claim 1.

Kim discloses in Figures 6 and 12-15, the boundary of semiconductor layer 36 clearly not coinciding with the metal (lower) layer 38. Thus, Kim fails to at least teach the at least one portion of boundary of the semiconductor layer substantially coincides with boundary of the lower film as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct in view of Kim. Claim 1 is not further rejected or objected and is therefore allowable. Claims 2, 5-7 and 9-11 variously depending from Claim 1, thus include all the limitations of amended Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2, 5-7 and 9-11 are believed to be patentably distinct and allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Kim.

Claims 20-22, 26 and 29, are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tagusa.

Claim 20 recites *inter alia*, a boundary of the semiconductor layer is exposed out of the data line except for places near the drain electrode and an end portion of the data line.

Appl. No. 10/619,668
Response dated: July 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 6, 2005

To support the rejection, the Examiner respectfully cites the semiconductor layer (34,64) is exposed out of the data line except for places near the drain electrode (36b,66b) and an end portion of the data line as teaching the limitation of Claim 20 recited above. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Tagusa in Figure 2 clearly shows the semiconductor layer 34 and its boundaries *fully covered* by source electrode 36a and drain electrode 36b. Figure 10 similarly shows the semiconductor layer 64 and its boundaries *fully covered* by source electrode 66a and drain electrode 66b. That is, there is *no boundary exposed* on either the source or drain electrode side in Tagusa. Thus, Tagusa fails to at least teach the boundary of the semiconductor layer is exposed out of the data line except for places near the drain electrode and an end portion of the data line as recited in Claim 20.

Accordingly, Claim 20 is believed to be patentably distinct in view of Tagusa. Claims 21-22, 26 and 29 variously depending from Claim 20, thus include all the limitations of Claim 20. Therefore, Claims 21-22, 26 and 29 are believed to be patentably distinct in view of Tagusa for at least the reasons given for Claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of Claims 20-22, 26 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Tagusa.

Claims 20-25, 27 and 28 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kim.

Kim does not at least teach boundary of the semiconductor layer is exposed out of the data line except for places near the drain electrode and an end portion of the data line as recited in Claim 20.

Kim discloses in Figures 6 and 12-15, the semiconductor layer 36 and its boundaries *fully covered* by source electrode and drain electrodes 41b. That is, there is *no boundary exposed* on either the source or drain electrode side in Kim. Thus, Kim fails to at least teach the boundary of the semiconductor layer is exposed out of the data line except for places near the drain electrode and an end portion of the data line as recited in Claim 20.

Accordingly, Claim 20 is believed to be patentably distinct in view of Kim. Claim 20 is not further rejected or objected and is therefore allowable. Claims 21-25, 27 and 28 variously

Appl. No. 10/619,668
Response dated: July 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 6, 2005

depending from Claim 20, thus include all the limitations of Claim 20. Therefore, Claims 21-25, 27 and 28 are believed to be patentably distinct and allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 20.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of Claims 20-25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Kim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Amy Bizon-Copp
Amy Bizon-Copp
Reg. No. 53,993
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: July 6, 2005